DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 723 TM 007 383

AUTHOR Francis, John Bruce; And Others
TITLE An Evaluation of Programs to Recognize and Reward Teaching Excellence. Project Summary.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Albany.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Sep 76
NOTE 34p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Awards; College Faculty; College Instruction; *College Teachers; Effective Teaching; Evaluation Criteria; Grants; Higher Education; *Improvement Programs; Information Dissemination; Instructional Improvement; *Professional Recognition; Program Attitudes; *Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *State University of New York

ABSTRACT

The Faculty Grants for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction, Excellence in Teaching Awards, and Distinguished Teaching Professorships programs were implemented in 1972 by the State University of New York (SUNY) in an effort to recognize and reward teaching excellence. An evaluation of these programs was conducted as part of a national assessment project sponsored by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The study included surveys of 1,500 faculty members to determine their awareness of and reaction to the programs, and a survey of program participants concerning the selection process and program impact. In addition, interviews were conducted at nine SUNY campuses with program administrators, committee members and participants concerning program implementation. Sample items are appended. Although each group expressed general approval of the programs, 85% of the faculty felt that they had little or no impact upon the importance accorded teaching. Program participants also felt that the most marked result of participation was heightened personal satisfaction, and administrators and committee members felt that factors irrelevant to teaching excellence had a bearing upon award decisions. The dissemination of information among departments, administration and campuses is a major barrier to the effectiveness of these programs. Suggestions for program improvements are offered. (Author/JAC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED156723

TM

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Bruce Francis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

AN EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS TO RECOGNIZE AND REWARD TEACHING EXCELLENCE

SEPTEMBER 1976

2

TM007 383

An Evaluation of Programs To Recognize and Reward Teaching Excellence

Central Administration
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

As Part Of

National Project III

"Enhancing the Importance Of Teaching"
Fund For The Improvement of Post-Secondary Education

PROJECT SUMMARY

by

John Bruce Francis, Research Director
Martin F. Finkelstein, Research Associate
Lisa T. Stratton, Research Associate

Department of Higher Education
State University of New York at Buffalo

SEPTEMBER 1976

Charles B. Neff, Project Director
Assistant Chancellor for Special Projects
State University of New York

ELEVATING THE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AND
FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the results of an evaluation study of State University's instructional grants and teaching awards programs. Data upon which the summary is based can be found in Appendix A. Further analyses are currently under way to clarify many questions raised by these results. A full report of the project is available from Dr. Charles Neff, Assistant Chancellor for Special Projects, SUNY Central.

PROJECT SUMMARY

In 1972, the State University of New York formally joined a national movement to elevate the importance of teaching by inaugurating three university-wide programs: Faculty Grants for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction (FGIUI), Excellence in Teaching Awards (EIT), and Distinguished Teaching Professorships (DTP). In 1975, SUNY was one of eleven institutions invited by the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, to participate in a national assessment of such programs. The purpose of SUNY's component of the national project were: (a) to understand how different programs contribute to the recognition and reward of good teaching; and (b) to make State University's current programs more responsive to the needs of faculty.

A three-phase study was undertaken by a research team from the Department of Higher Education at the University Center at Buffalo. Phase I surveyed a random sample of SUNY faculty to ascertain their awareness and general reactions to the three programs. Phase II surveyed those faculty who had applied for a grant or been nominated for an award (whether successful or not) to ascertain their perceptions of the selection process and program impact. Phase III produced case studies at a number of SUNY campuses of how the programs are implemented at the campus level. The results yielded a descriptive picture of the grants/awards program and recommendations for their improvement.

The Programs

The Faculty Grants for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction (FGIUI), which developed as a "teaching foundation" analogous to SUNY's Faculty Awards for Research, provides grants of up to $2,000 for instructional improvement projects. The Distinguished

Teaching Professorship (DTP), which was designed to accord prestige equivalent to that of the Distinguished Professorship, provides a promotion in rank above Full Professor and a permanent salary increment of up to $2,500. The Excellence in Teaching Award (EIT), designed to recognize faculty without the requisite length of service for the DTP, provides a $500 one-time cash award and a certificate of recognition by the Chancellor.

All three programs are funded directly by the Chancellor with monies provided from overhead on grants and contracts, and are administered through the office of the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Policy. Decisions to award instructional grants are made by a Central Awards Committee on the basis of system-wide review of grant proposals. Decisions to award Distinguished Teaching Professorship and Excellence in Teaching Awards are made by the Chancellor from lists of nominees submitted by campus presidents and reviewed by a Joint Advisory Committee and the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Policy.

Participation in Award Programs

During the four years of the faculty grants program, over 2,100 proposals have been submitted requesting almost 2.6 million dollars and involving over 1,500 faculty members from 68 of the State University's 72 campuses. One hundred-sixty projects involving 213 faculty members on 37 SUNY campuses have been funded for a total of over $334,000. Although applications have come from faculty at nearly 95% of the eligible campuses, individuals at only half the campuses have received awards, disproportionately more at University Centers, Four-year colleges, and Agricultural and Technical colleges. The number of applications declined abruptly after the first year...from 421 in 1972-73 to 238 in 1973-74.

Faculty in the Natural Sciences have submitted the most applications (408) but have had the poorest success rate (12%) while faculty in the Humanities have submitted far fewer (163) with a slightly higher success rate (17%), the highest success rate for all disciplines. Grants have been distributed equally among junior and senior faculty, with Associate Professors receiving the most.

Excellence in Teaching Awards (EIT)

During the three years for which data are available, 51 campuses have nominated 402 faculty for EIT awards, and with 346 awards made. Nearly every campus that has submitted nominations has received at least one award. Most awards have been given to faculty in the Social Sciences and Natural Sciences with substantially fewer going to faculty in the Fine Arts or in Professional Schools.

Distinguished Teaching Professorship (DTP)

During the first three years of the program, 25 of 54 faculty nominated have been designated as DTP's with most coming from the Natural and Social Sciences and very few from Professional Fields. Sixteen of the 21 campuses who have nominated faculty for DTP have been successful.

Faculty Awareness of the Programs: Results of Phase I

Fifty-seven percent of the 1,500 randomly selected SUNY faculty responded to the Phase I survey of awareness and general attitudes about the award programs. Only some 37% of those responding indicated that they knew much about the programs, with information coming most often via departmental communications and least often from campus presidents or SUNY Central. The information dissemination with which faculty were most satisfied was that dealing with grant and award logistics (application procedures, deadlines, and types of fundable projects), while information dissemination about proposal review and award nomination and selection criteria was viewed as less adequate.

Although a large proportion of faculty felt that rewards for teaching excellence and grants to develop improved instruction were effective approaches to encouraging and rewarding good teaching, 85% indicated that the SUNY awards and grants programs had little or no impact on the importance accorded teaching, which had remained generally the same over the past few years. Evidently, encouraging and rewarding good teaching does not itself have much impact on the importance accorded it.

Yet faculty support the programs, feel that the money spent on them is well-spent, and do not believe that remediation of weaker teachers is preferable to recognizing good ones. On the contrary, many feel that current policies do not sufficiently direct grants and awards to those who most deserve them, and that campuses whose mission is primarily teaching should receive a greater share. The programs are viewed by large majorities of faculty as just as important as publications and research grants for promotion, tenure, and sabbatical authorizations.

Winning a teaching award or an instructional grant is an important professional aspiration for over 70% of the faculty, exceeded in importance only by the aspiration to write and/or publish (80%), and by the aspiration to continue doing what they are currently doing (93%). One can interpret this latter percentage as evidence of general faculty fulfillment or as evidence of inertia; but it suggests that involvement in the grants and award programs is clearly seen as extra activity, and may require special facilitation.

Phase I, while not yet completely analyzed, suggests that the objectives of the grants and awards programs are generally shared by SUNY faculty and should continue. However, not enough is known about program specifics, and, as currently structured and implemented, programs have not had much real impact on the importance of teaching.

Participant Attitudes: Findings of Phase II

Fifty-five percent of the 1,200 participants (grant applicants or award nominees, successful or unsuccessful) in the programs responded to the Phase II survey of their attitudes about the process and outcomes of involvement.

The only real impact of participation seems to have been heightened personal satisfaction. In a majority of cases, little or no impact was seen on departmental status, effectiveness as a teacher, involvement in teaching improvement efforts, being called upon as a consultant, student satisfaction with teaching, interaction with students in class, and teaching style...all stayed about the same.

But again, as with faculty generally, participants did not want to see any of the programs eliminated. Improvements were suggested, including a wider spread of smaller grants and awards and better coordination of them with campus curricular planning--implying that the keys to greater impact may be diffusion and integration rather than increase of resources allocated.

The Selection Process

Teaching award nominees favor selection criteria which reflect a progressive notion of "teachers responsible for student development" rather than the more traditional view of "scholars who teach." Thus they favor such criteria as high standards for student achievement and academic excellence, concern for the intellectual and social growth of individual students, generosity with time, and easy accessibility. They generally reject the criteria of scholarship as demonstrated through publications or artistic productions.

Instructional grant applicants concentrate on the qualities of the proposal as crucial to success. Such criteria as feasibility, well-explained goals and rationale, clearly stated and attainable objectives, documentation of staff capability, innovativeness in substance and methodology, and expected benefit to students are viewed as most important; while criteria of importance to administrators such as potential number of students to be helped, repeatability of the project, and campus support are seen by participants as of less importance.

After an idea for a project was translated into a decision to apply for a SUNY Faculty Grant (most often because funds were not readily available elsewhere) the project was generally developed

through discussion with colleagues, technical experts, and students. Far less often were the traditional research channels such as conference papers, articles, or books used, suggesting a need for communication networks rather than instructional resource centers as aids to grant attainment.

Impact of Success

Grant recipients generally continued their projects after the grant expired and reported that the project's greatest impact was upon students rather than upon the instructional process. As a consequence of programs implemented via instructional grants, recipients felt that students enjoyed their experiences more, learned something different, and retained what they learned longer. They did not learn the same with less investment of campus resources, nor learn the same amount with less effort. Clearly the recipients did not stress the resource-saving, efficiency aspects of instructional grants, nor think them very important.

Program Implementation: Findings of Phase III

Nine SUNY campuses were visited to gather information about how the grants and award programs actually function and with what consequences. Over 100 interviews were held with program administrators and committee members, as well as with successful and unsuccessful program participants. Campuses were selected to provide maximum contrast on five dimensions: level of participation, degree of success, pattern of participation (decreasing, stable or increasing), campus size, and campus climate (defined by relative emphasis on research vs. teaching, liberal vs. technical education, and progressiveness vs. conservatism of educational philosophy). Findings from these case studies clarified and enriched the findings from the surveys of Phases I and II.

Faculty Grants Program - On most campuses, the FGIUI is treated as if it were any other extramural funding program in which faculty can participate as individuals. Most faculty do not distinguish the grants from other research grants, and consider them to be too small.

There is little or no integration of funded projects with departmental curricular planning; and department members are almost never aware that a colleague has submitted an application. Campus faculty who serve on the Central Awards Committee do not generally serve as a link between the campus and SUNY Central. They have never felt that such was their role.

Four factors were discovered which hinder faculty participation. They are:

1. The grant announcements arrive too late to permit careful preparation of a proposal.

2. Those initially motivated to submit proposals are discouraged by the high failure rate.

3. The low probability of success (which rapidly became widespread knowledge) led many to avoid even applying.

4. The small size of the grant made a large investment of faculty time not worth the effort.

When faculty do apply, success seems to be made more likely by the presence on campus of some person who takes responsibility to "push" the potential awardee...first to decide to apply, and then to develop a strong proposal. Sometimes the "prime mover," is an assistant dean in charge of instructional development, or the director of a Learning Resources Center who informs faculty, cajoles them, and even helps write the proposal. On those campuses, the success rate is significantly higher. This "prime mover" role has at times been taken by a whole department which undertakes a grant project as a form of curricular or instructional revitalization.

The impact of a successful grant application is most positive for the individual awardees who feel that being awarded a grant has contributed to their professional development and to the experience of their students. But rarely are there significant changes in departmental curricular or instructional methods or in enhancing the importance of teaching, except where the grant project itself involved departmental reorganization or where the department was unusually collegial.

One major concern voiced by grant recipients was the apparent lack of follow-through by Central Administration, either for disseminating the results of successful projects or for explaining to unsuccessful applicants the reasons for rejection.

The Teaching Awards - To faculty, winning a teaching award (whether EIT or DTP) carries more prestige than receiving a grant and a majority of faculty support the program's concept and goals.

Opposition in principle to the awards by a minority of faculty took several forms including:

a) The awards represent "tokenism" by Central Administration rather than acceptance of responsibility for the real improvement of teaching.

b) The "star" orientation of the awards singles out individuals at the expense of group solidarity (a union view) or of departmental collegiality (a view of departments working as a group to improve instruction).

c) Spending money on awards in a time of fiscal crisis is irresponsible (a view of those who would expect unused award funds to flow into campus operating budgets).

The majority of faculty, however, find the award programs laudable but lacking in credibility, because success seems to depend on factors irrelevant to teaching excellence. Some of the factors alluded to were:

1. Unless a person in the potential nominee's department sets the nomination process in motion, many faculty are reluctant to "push" their own candidacy (even to the extent of preparing their own dossier). Thus with awards as well as grants, a "prime mover" is necessary.

2. Conversely, those faculty with the "chutzpah" to prepare and advertise their case stood a greater chance of being successful, regardless of actual teaching excellence.

3. Faculty in specialized departments or in those open only to majors have a lower probability of being nominated because their teaching does not attract the attention of a large segment of the student body.

4. Faculty in departments which emphasize cooperative approaches to instructional improvement have less chance of being nominated because their departments will not single out one individual for special honor.

5. Faculty whose teaching excellence could be more readily documented have a greater chance of being nominated and selected. Campus screening committees tend to be more inclined to select as nominees those whose dossiers contain more than student evaluations and colleague testimonials. This usually means that those dossiers buttressed by a substantial publication list are given preference.

Another source of concern is that nominations are sometimes used to reward faculty for departmental or campus-wide service when conventional rewards are unavailable. In one case a DTP nomination was given to a senior professor upon retirement. In another, an EIT nomination was made to compensate a professor for having carried an extra teaching load.

A final source of concern relates to perceptions and practices of screening committees which arbitrarily limit the pool of potential nominees. These are:

1. That teaching awards constitute recognition for doing an excellent job with a particular course. Thus younger faculty or newer faculty are eliminated who haven't yet become identified with "their own course."

2. That "great teacher" is synonomous with "great lecturer." Those who have not taught large lecture courses or who are at their best in advanced seminars simply do not have as much chance.

3. That nominees for DTP who are not selected are automatically shifted to EIT competition, thus effectively squeezing out junior faculty for whom the EIT program was intended.

4. That the campus nominating committees are ad hoc arrangements with no continuity from year to year, and no organizational link to committees or units concerned with the improvement of teaching.

Impact of the Awards

Winning an award brings personal pleasure to the recipient and a certain amount of recognition (primarily from off-campus colleagues); but also subjects the winner to a host of committee assignments relating to the administrative aspects of teaching improvement, which are difficult to turn down. DTP's often indicated that one result of winning was having less time for research and scholarship and even of suffering some loss of prestige as a researcher or scholar. For younger faculty, a teaching award might enhance an otherwise modest research record, but cannot substitute for a poor one.

A major disappointment was the failure of either the campus or Central Administration to follow through with publicity about the winners and/or use of the winner's skills to enhance teaching. Careful follow-through would not only link award recipients to instructional improvement efforts on campus but would improve selection procedures by giving public exposure to all winners.

Finally, it appears that the grants and awards programs involve a rather small nucleus (about 20 to 30) of the same faculty over and over. SUNY's major challenge in enhancing the importance of teaching is to expand that core pool...to find ways to use the efforts of the few to generate a chain reaction among the many.

Recommendations

The following suggestions for improving the SUNY grants and award programs are based upon inferences drawn from the data of the study. Hopefully they will serve to generate full discussion among faculty, administrations, and students about how teaching in SUNY can become more important and more effective.

1. Information about grants and awards should be disseminated as much as possible at the departmental or divisional level where it is most likely to reach the largest number of potential participants. This means that every eligible member should receive an announcement about the programs early in the academic year.

2. Special effort should be made to inform faculty at Agricultural and Technical Colleges and at Community Colleges about the availability of Faculty Grants for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction.

3. There should be a University-wide commitment by all active participants to make as many SUNY faculty aware of the availability of grants and awards as possible.

4. The Chancellor or his designee should formally encourage all campuses to become active participants in the teaching award programs.

5. Faculty Grants for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction should be given separate visibility by being distinguished as clearly as possible at the local campus level from research grants.

6. One individual on each campus should be formally designated to serve as principal administrative supporter (prime mover) for the nomination and application process for faculty grants and teaching awards. Such a person should develop networks of communication among faculty seeking to improve instruction.

7. The amount of campus-level resources dedicated to teaching awards and faculty grants should be increased, with campuses setting aside a portion of their operating budget for this purpose to supplement funds available from Central Administration.

8. Faculty Grants for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction should be directed more to team efforts with faculty time for team members being assigned to course and curriculum development. Awards for team projects should be considerably larger than the current $2,000 per grant.

9. Efforts should be made on local campuses to link instructional grant projects to more general curriculum change within departments. To this end, much greater departmental commitment to securing instructional improvement grants and to making substantive use of teaching award winners is necessary.

10. Nominations for Excellence in Teaching Awards should be separate from Distinguished Teaching Professorships. There should be no presumption that unsuccessful DTP nominees should head the list of those being considered for EIT awards.

11. Any grant proposal or award nomination dossier should include a plan for the special use of the successful participant's skills or dissemination of the results of a project throughout the State University. SUNY Central publication resources should be made available for such dissemination.

Final Note

Extensive secondary analyses of these data comparing faculty across campus types, rank, discipline, and level of program participation are currently under way as part of the projects's second year. Suggestions for these analyses are welcome and should be directed to:

Dr. Bruce Francis
Department of Higher Education
State University at Buffalo
487 Christopher Baldy Hall
Amherst, New York 14260

APPENDIX

Percentage Responses to All Items - Phase I

1. How familiar are you with the SUNY teaching awards and grants to improve undergraduate instructio

1	2	3	4
no knowledge	vague familiarity	considerable familiarity	detailed knowledge
8.3%	54.6%	30.2%	6.9%

2. Where did you learn about the SUNY teaching awards and grants to improve undergraduate instruction? (Check all that apply).

	Percentage
a. Department or divisional communication.....	59.8
b. Campus research office.....	30.6
c. Campus President's office.....	18.8
d. Campus newspaper.....	25.8
e. SUNY Central office.....	13.1

3. How satisfied are you with the information made available about each of the following aspects of the grants and awards programs?

	1 very satisfied	2 somewhat satisfied	3 somewhat dissatisfied	4 very dissatisfied
a. Type of projects for which instructional improvement grants are given.....	10.2	39.5	29.2	21.1
b. Application procedures for instructional improvement grants.....	12.6	40.8	29.2	17.4
c. Deadlines for receipt of grant proposals or award nominations.....	19.7	38.3	24.6	17.4
d. Criteria and procedures for review of grant proposals.....	7.6	34.5	32.3	25.7
e. Nomination procedures for teaching awards..	9.3	30.9	27.1	32.7
f. Criteria and procedures for selection of teaching award recipients.....	9.4	26.6	27.6	36.4

4. Over the past few years the importance accorded teaching by my department/division has:

1	2	3
increased	remained about the same	decreased
26.6	59.9	13.5

5. How much impact have the SUNY grant and award programs had on the importance accorded teachin by your department/division?

1	2	3	4
a great deal	a moderate amount	rather little	none at all
1.5	12.3	37.6	48.6

6. How important would the availability of each of the following be in encouraging you to design and execute a project for improving undergraduate instruction?

	1 very important	2 somewhat important	3 somewhat unimportant	4 very unimportant
a. Supplemental pay.....	35.3	37.0	17.0	10.7
b. Released time.....	60.7	25.5	7.9	5.9
c. Summer grants.....	53.8	29.4	9.6	7.2
d. Office space.....	7.9	11.9	28.2	51.9
e. Technical assistance from instructional development specialists.....	26.7	40.7	18.5	14.1

7. How effective is each approach listed below in encouraging and rewarding good teaching?

	1 very effective	2 somewhat effective	3 somewhat ineffective	4 very ineffective
a. Campus workshops on improving instruction...	10.5	41.4	26.0	22.1
b. Rewards for teaching excellence.....	26.7	39.1	18.6	15.6
c. Public recognition for good teaching.....	32.3	42.5	14.2	10.9
d. Student evaluation of instruction.....	22.9	46.6	20.2	10.3
e. Centers for instructional improvement.....	11.6	34.9	32.7	20.8
f. Professional association conferences on instructional improvement.....	16.4	42.6	24.9	16.1
g. Provision of outside consultants.....	10.1	36.5	29.0	24.4
h. Grants to develop improved instruction.....	38.0	44.7	11.9	5.4

8. Listed below are professional aspirations you might have for the coming academic year. How important is each to you?

	1 very important	2 somewhat important	3 somewhat unimportant	4 very unimportan
a. Serve as a consultant in government or industry	11.6	24.4	21.8	42.2
b. Receive a teaching award or instructional grant	32.3	38.6	18.4	10.7
c. Spend more time advising students	25.0	42.0	21.6	11.4
d. Obtain a research grant	29.2	32.9	20.5	17.3
e. Be elected to College/University Senate	2.0	12.4	33.1	62.5
f. Become an institutional administrator (e.g. chairperson, dean)	4.1	12.1	17.0	66.8
g. Receive tenure or a promotion	38.5	23.6	11.1	26.8
h. Write and/or publish	48.0	31.7	11.1	9.1
i. Continue what I am now doing	65.3	28.9	4.0	1.8

9. How important a role should each of the following play in developing ways to recognize and reward good teaching?

	1 very important	2 somewhat important	3 somewhat unimportant	4 very unimporta
a. Academic Departments	79.0	15.3	3.1	2.6
b. State Education Department	10.7	33.6	26.3	29.4
c. Federal agencies (e.g. NSF, NIMH)	9.2	27.9	31.4	31.4
d. Individual campus administration	51.4	32.3	10.0	6.3
e. Professional associations	25.3	41.1	20.0	13.6
f. Professional unions	12.5	22.8	25.7	39.0
g. SUNY Central Administration	20.6	32.8	21.2	25.5

10. Using the scale below, please indicate how important receiving a teaching award should be relative to publications in:

	1 Teaching Award More Important	2 Teaching Award Equally Impor.	3 Teaching Award Less Important
a. Promotion/Tenure decisions	37.3	46.2	16.5
b. Sabbatical Authorizations	22.1	51.7	26.3

11. How much influence should each of the following groups have in selecting recipients of teaching awards and instructional grants?

	1 a great deal	2 a moderate amount	3 only slightly	4 not at all
a. Faculty	63.0	27.4	4.2	3.2
b. Students	45.3	38.5	10.9	5.4
c. SUNY Central staff	2.8	22.4	37.4	37.4
d. Outside experts in instructional development	9.8	27.2	32.1	30.8
e. Campus administrators	12.3	43.1	26.6	18.0
f. Lay public	1.5	5.2	23.1	70.3
g. Professional unions	1.2	8.9	21.8	68.1

12. Using the scale below, please indicate how important receiving an instructional grant should be relative to receiving a research grant in:

	1 Instructional Grants more important	2 Inst. Grants equally impor.	3 Instructional Grants less important
a. Promotion/Tenure decisions	24.4	57.8	17.9
b. Sabbatical Authorizations	16.4	61.3	22.3

13. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	1 strongly agree	2 somewhat agree	3 somewhat disagree	4 strongly disagree
a. The money spent for grants to improve undergraduate instruction is well spent.....	27.3	42.9	22.5	7.3
b. Generally, the individuals who deserve grants for instructional development don't get them.	15.6	41.1	34.2	9.0
c. The money spent for teaching awards is well spent.....	27.1	36.9	23.2	12.8
d. Generally, the individuals who deserve awards for excellence in teaching do not receive them.....	21.9	38.1	31.3	8.7
e. Since teaching is their job, faculty should not be given special recognition for good teaching.....	8.1	11.7	17.6	62.6
f. Money now spent to recognize good teachers would be better spent to help weaker teachers improve.....	8.5	26.0	33.6	31.9
g. Campuses whose mission is primarily teaching should receive a larger share of the awards..	30.5	27.5	19.5	22.5

Percentage Response To All Items - Phase II

1. Please indicate the number of times since 1972 you have been:	Total	1	2	3	4 or more
a. A recipient of an instructional grant.....	136	109	20	5	2
b. An applicant for an instructional grant.....	384	248	89	36	8
c. A recipient of an excellence in teaching award.....	167	162	4	1	-
d. A nominee for an excellence in teaching award.....	280	185	68	26	1
e. A recipient of a distinguished teaching professorship.....	19	19	-	-	-
f. A nominee for a distinguished teaching professorship.....	72	57	12	3	-

2. How much has each of the following changed as a result of your participation in the grant or award programs?

(N=599)	1 increased a great deal	2 increased a moderate amount	3 stayed about the same	4 decreased a moderate amount	5 decreased a great deal
a. My status in my department.....	4.0	25.8	67.2	2.0	1.0
b. My effectiveness as a teacher..	7.4	32.4	58.1	1.5	0.5
c. My sense of professional satisfaction.....	28.0	36.2	26.7	7.2	1.8
d. My general involvement in teaching improvement on campus	8.1	30.3	59.2	1.5	.8
e. The extent to which I have been consulted by administrators and colleagues on the improvement of teaching.....	4.8	20.5	72.0	1.9	.8
f. Student satisfaction with my teaching.....	5.0	25.7	67.6	1.5	0.2
g. The amount of faculty-student interaction in my course.....	6.9	20.9	70.6	1.4	0.2
h. My teaching style.....	5.9	26.7	66.7	0.5	0.2

3. The faculty grants program and teaching awards programs could be improved by: (Check as many as you feel apply).

	PERCENTAGE (N=688)
a. Increasing the number of grants.....	57%
b. Increasing the number of awards.....	36%
c. Increasing the amount of money per proj.	28%
d. Increasing the amount of the cash award..	19%
e. Relating the grants to campus curricular planning.....	45%
f. Relating the awards to campus curricular planning.....	28%

4. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following:

	1 strongly agree %	2 agree %	3 disagree %	4 strongly disagree %
a. The Distinguished Teaching Professorship award should be eliminated.....	11.5	8.1	33.5	46.8
b. The Excellence in Teaching award should be eliminated.....	10.7	6.7	28.9	53.7
c. The Faculty Grants for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction should be eliminated	1.4	2.2	21.7	74.8

The following questions were answered by those who were nominated for or received a teaching award.

5. Please indicate your agreement with inclusion of the following criteria for selecting of teaching awards:

(N=409)	1 strongly agree	2 agree	3 disagree	4 strongly disagree
a. Mastery of several teaching techniques.....	37.9	40.1	15.5	6.4
b. Flexible instructional policy which adapts readily to student needs, interests, and problems.....	56.5	37.3	4.2	2.0
c. Generosity with personal time and accessibility.....	62.0	33.2	3.6	1.2
d. Continual concern with the intellectual and social growth of individual students.....	67.5	29.1	2.4	1.0
e. High standards for student achievement and academic excellence of students.....	64.5	32.0	2.2	1.2
f. Evidence of student evaluation that discriminates among final levels of competence..	40.8	44.5	10.5	4.3
g. Recommendation for an award can only go to a faculty member who has regularly carried a normal teaching load for his/her campus.....	51.1	26.8	15.5	6.6
h. General scholarship, demonstrated through publications or artistic production.....	15.6	31.5	39.1	13.7

6. Please describe the type of instructor you feel receives teaching effectiveness awards.

ANALYSES OF THIS QUESTION ARE SCHEDULED FOR YEAR 2

The following questions were answered by those who have applied for or received a grant to improve undergraduate instruction.

7. How important were the following antecedent conditions in suggesting the need for your proposed project?

(N=377)	1 very important %	2 somewhat important %	3 somewhat unimportant %	4 very unimportan %
a. Student dissatisfaction with a course or program	12.3	31.7	19.5	36.5
b. Peer or colleague dissatisfaction with a course or program	7.2	19.5	27.2	46.1
c. A change in departmental emphasis	7.6	22.4	25.4	44.6
d. A change in colleague emphasis	4.1	19.3	25.6	51.0
e. A visceral feeling	35.1	34.0	10.7	20.0
f. Decreasing enrollments	2.5	7.4	21.5	68.7
g. A change in, or addition to, my field, discipline or profession	30.9	21.3	16.2	31.6
h. Hearing about success with the idea elsewhere	15.3	28.2	20.1	36.5
i. A change or improvement in instructional technology	38.5	29.7	11.7	20.2
j. A low rating by an accrediting body	0	1.1	12.1	86.8

8. How important were the following circumstances in stimulating you to apply for a SUNY Faculty Grant for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction?

(N=395)	1 very important %	2 somewhat important %	3 somewhat unimportant %	4 very unimportant %
a. Encouragement from departmental or college administrators	13.5	27.3	15.8	43.4
b. Encouragement from colleagues	11.0	26.2	23.8	39.0
c. Lack of available money from other funding sources	50.3	25.5	10.2	14.0
d. Lack of available money from regular departmental or college sources	63.4	20.2	6.6	9.8
e. Stimulation by the announcement of the SUNY Grants program	41.3	41.8	7.6	9.4
f. Hearing about a colleague's project having been funded	6.3	16.0	16.5	61.2

9. How important were each of the following in influencing your thinking about the development of your project?

(N=389)	1 very important %	2 somewhat important %	3 somewhat unimportant %	4 very unimportant %
a. Discussions with colleagues in your discipline (at your institution or elsewhere)...	33.9	38.6	11.3	16.2
b. Discussions with individuals in fields which support instructional improvement (e.g. media specialists, education specialists, etc.).....	22.4	29.6	16.0	32.0
c. Discussions with students.....	28.1	41.0	16.8	14.2
d. A paper heard at a professional meeting.....	18.7	61.6		
e. Article in a discipline-related journal.....	11.0	27.2	18.8	43.1
f. Articles in educational or psychological journal.....	9.6	21.1	16.7	52.6
g. Books and/or monographs.....	8.9	26.8	17.8	46.5

10. Please indicate your agreement with inclusion of the following criteria for selection of grants for improving undergraduate instruction.

(N=417)	1 strongly agree %	2 agree %	3 disagree %	4 strongly disagree %
a. Well explained goals and rationale.....	77.0	21.8	1.0	0.2
b. Clearly stated and attainable objectives.....	74.1	21.8	3.6	0.5
c. Documentation of adequacy and capability of staff for project implementation.....	49.1	44.0	5.8	1.0
d. Reasonableness of project budget.....	47.9	48.9	2.4	0.7
e. Innovative in substance.....	37.5	47.7	11.4	3.4
f. Innovative in methodology.....	31.4	43.5	20.5	4.6
g. Equality of distribution of grants among institutional types and disciplines.....	27.3	24.1	29.2	19.5
h. Some degree of campus support.....	16.2	46.4	25.1	12.3
i. Repeatability of project.....	23.8	45.7	23.3	7.1
j. Positive results in terms of student-learner outcomes.....	41.7	43.7	11.1	3.5
k. Potential number of students to be benefited.	18.4	45.5	29.3	6.8
l. Feasibility in terms of time-frame, type of campus and students involved.....	33.6	59.4	5.1	1.9

11. Briefly describe the type of grant you feel receives funding.

ANALYSES OF THIS QUESTION ARE SCHEDULED FOR YEAR 2.

The following questions were answered by those who have received a faculty grant for the improvement of undergraduate instruction.

12. Which of the following descriptions best characterizes the present state of the results of you project?

	Responses	Percentage (N=136)
a. It is being continued in original form.....	42	.30
b. It was reduced in scope but is being continued.....	33	.24
c. It is being continued in expanded form.....	47	.34
d. It was cancelled.....	15	.11

13. To your knowledge, is the program or course you developed being used by other instructors? Check those categories for which your answer is yes.

	Responses	Percentage (N=136)
In your department.....	61	.44
In other departments.....	35	.25
In other colleges or universities.....	35	.25

14. Please rate the extent to which your project has contributed to either instructional effectiveness or efficiency in the following areas. Use the scale provided.

(N=136)	1 to a great extent %	2 considerable %	3 little %	4 not at all %
a. More students learn the material.....	33.6	42.0	16.8	7.6
b. Students retain what they learn longer.....	33.6	40.9	17.3	8.2
c. Students learn the <u>same</u> with less resources investment.....	19.3	21.1	20.2	39.4
d. Students learn the same by working less.....	10.9	14.5	18.2	56.4
e. Students enjoy the experience more.....	48.7	37.0	11.8	2.5
f. Students learn something different.....	37.5	30.0	20.0	12.5

15. Did nomination or receiving of your award or grant produce any unanticipated results?

ANALYSES OF THIS QUESTION ARE SCHEDULED FOR YEAR 2

16. On what type of campus do you teach? (N=668)

University Center	22.5	Four-year College	34.3
Statutory College	3.0	Community College	23.7
Agricultural and Technical College	12.1	Specialized College	4.4

17. What is your present faculty rank?

Instructor	1.1	Assistant Professor	28.9
Lecturer	.8	Associate Professor	36.2
Full Professor	30.3	Distinguished Professor	2.7

18. In which department or division do you teach?

19. What is your age? Mean = 41.25 years

20. What is your highest academic degree?

Academic Masters	Professional Doctorate	Academic Doctorate
28.3%	10%	56.4%

	Average
21. How many years have you been a full-time faculty member at your present institution?	9.02 ye
in SUNY?	9.22 ye
in postsecondary education?	11.84 ye

22. Are you presently tenured?

Yes	No
75.8%	24.1%

23. What proportion of your work was devoted to the following activities during the past academic year (1974-1975)? Please use percentages that sum to 100%.

	Average
Teaching.....	61.9%
Advisement.....	9.2%
Research.....	12.6%
Governance.....	5.7%
Professional Service...	4.9%
Other.....	5.7%